

APR 5 1922

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XV, No. 21

MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1922

WHOLE NO. 417



## COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

In the City of New York

SUMMER SESSION

July 10 - August 18, 1922



Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., M.D., and various diplomas of Teachers College.

### COURSES IN GREEK, LATIN, AND ANCIENT HISTORY

Elementary: Courses for beginners in Greek and Latin—Xenophon—Caesar's Gallic War—Vergil's Aeneid I-VI—Cicero's Orations—Latin Prose Composition (for admission)—Ancient History (general).

Advanced: Sophocles and Aristophanes—Vergil's Aeneid I-XII—Horace's Satires—Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus—Latin Prose Composition (for teachers)—Latin Prose Composition (for the A.M. degree)—Methods of teaching Latin—Demonstration Class in Beginning Latin—Roman Private Life—History of Greece and Rome—The Ancient Orient and the Near East.

**THEY SAY**  
**OF**  
**COLLAR AND DANIELL'S**  
**FIRST YEAR LATIN, REVISED**

We are using Collar and Daniell's First Year Latin, Revised. . . . Our teachers express themselves as satisfied with this book.

The most satisfactory book for first-year pupils we have ever used.

After experimenting with several first year Latin books I have decided to return to Collar and Daniell for our first year classes. I consider it the most satisfactory book for that work.

Ernst Riess  
Boys' High School,  
New York City

Walter E. Foster  
Stuyvesant High School  
New York City

Charles H. Breed  
Lawrenceville School,  
Lawrenceville N. J.

**70 Fifth Ave. GINN AND COMPANY New York**

**Quotations**

*(from letters written by teachers who are using Place's Beginning Latin)*

"The results are the most satisfactory I have ever had. The pupils excel both in accuracy and enthusiasm".

"Its approach to the subject by the way of the English route is delightful. It makes clear the similarity of the two languages and their differences by simple illustrations".

"No one can find Latin dull or uninteresting, with a book like this in his hands".

"It presents various devices for study which are usually left to the teacher to supply. It emphasizes essentials, it is accurate and entertaining".

"I have used Place's Beginning Latin in several classes this term and it has proved satisfactory in every respect. It gives the pupils a better understanding of Latin and has created a greater interest in the subject than any book I have hitherto used".

**PLACE'S BEGINNING LATIN**, by Perley O. Place, Litt. D.,  
Syracuse University

NEW YORK

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

• CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XV, No. 21

MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1922

WHOLE NO. 417

## LATIN SALUTATORY<sup>1</sup>

Vobis, collegae mei omnes, qui huc convenistis fortasse sicuti antiquitus Athenienses ad novam rem audiendam, nihil novi vel praeter expectationem adfero. Nos enim omnes antiquae fidei defendendae totam vividam vim animi dedicavimus, quare non necesse est neque ullo modo decet me vos adhortari ut magnos labores vestros fortiter atque audacter toleretis, quippe qui id ipsum assidue factitatis ac laudabiliter.

Duo autem proposita sunt vel praecpta quae summatim attingere volo, non quod omnino nova sint vel inaudita, sed quod saepius negleguntur. Ac quo commodius disputationes meae explicentur, eas separatim exponam.

Primum igitur propositum hoc est. Nos, qui iuvenes in linguis litterisque et Graecorum et Romanorum erudire volumus, ipsi ea studia propter ignaviam nostram vel lenititudinem labi ac languescere sivimus. Plane enim appareat, immo vero proverbium est tritum ac celebratum, plures nostri saeculi utilitatem quasi veram deam colere venerarique. Sed non tritum sit nisi verum. Nos autem, apud quos fides habetur in cultura animi atque in litteris humanioribus, nihilominus multorum imperitorum indoctorumque vociferationibus ac clamoribus perterriti, ita humiles facti sumus atque animo demissi ut fidem quae in nobis est perraro praedicare audeamus.

Propositum meum clarius fortasse illustrare possum si sermonem vobis renuntiem qui nuper inter me et medicum quendam habitus est. Filium quidem suum, cum ad linguae Latinae studium recolendum se recipere vellet, hic pater strenue vetuerat, quamobrem de hoc arbitrio ego cum patre disputavi.

"Nonne multi?", inquam, "ad te veniunt ut sanentur?". "Multi", inquit. Et ego, "Aegri te visitant quia sunt aegroti nec sciunt quomodo ipsi se sanent?". "Certe". "Nec tu sinis ipsos aegrotos medicinam sibi praescribere qua opus sit?". "Minime", inquit, "nam prorsus ignari sunt medicinarum, qua ex ipsa causa ad me veniunt. Ego autem iam multos annos studio rationis disciplinaeque medicinarum penitus deditus sum, quare consilium meum auctoritatemque aegri petunt". "Atque eos", inquam, "stultos esse recte iudices, si se ad mercatorem vel advocationem vel magistrum sanandi causa recipient?". "Maxime", inquit, "nam neque advocati nec magistri mercatores ullam habent vel disciplinam vel auctoritatem in arte medica, quare nullo modo deceat eos curationem medicinamque praescribere". "Nonne", inquam, "est medici officium aegrotis praescribere qua medicina quibusque regulis opus sit?". "Certe". "Atque magistri officium est discipulis praescribere quibus studiis

opus sit?". "Etiam". "Neque deceat magistrum vel advocationem medicinam aegroto imperare?". "Non deceat". "Ac magister vel advocationis qui id conetur ardelio curiosior et stultissimus habeatur?". "Etiam". Et ego, "Tu quidem quatenus in pueris erudiendis vel in lingua Latina versatus es?". "Mehercule, non omnino". "Nullam igitur", inquam, "habes vel disciplinam in his artibus vel auctoritatem?". "Prorsus nullam". "Neque tu magister es?". "Absit omen!". "Agedum", inquam, "dic mihi tandem quoniam iure tu, qui medicus es, audeas meam auctoritatem praeterire ac contempnere, cum filio tuo ad eum recte erudiendum linguae Latinae studium praescribam atque imperem? Nonne tu quoque ardelio maxime curiosus ac stultus?". Ille autem ridens nihilominus filium vetuit se studio linguae Latinae dare.

Tenetis certe quorūsum haec pertineant quae loquor. Advocati quidem auctoritatem suam in legitimis et civilibus controversiis, sicuti in quaestionibus de medicina et sanitate medici suam, strenue defendere semper parati sunt, neque ullo modo tolerent si ignari se in alienis negotiis immisceant. Nos autem magistri, ubicumque imperita et ignara multitudo nos iurgo ac vi ridiculi adorti sunt, saepius per ignaviam nostram ex omnibus quibus stabamus locis perfidiose recessimus. "Vox populi vox dei", ut dicitur, quam autem sententiam necesse est nos quoque magistros sicut medicos vel advocationes parvi aestimare, quippe quibus auctoritas nostra disciplinaque ac fides fortiter defendendae sint. Si enim nobis vere persuasum est studium linguae Latinae et hodie utilissimum esse et magni preti, oportet nos hanc fidem magna voce et validius praedicare, quorum vox sine dubio maiore iure auditur quam illa imperitae turbae.

Sed haec quidem hactenus. Aliud tandem propositum est quod fere nemo attigit, quod autem mihi minime praetermittere licet. Dixi supra de fide quae in nobis sita est. Sed apud quot nostrum est haec fides intelligens, consentanea rationi, probabilis, vel cuiusmodi ratio probabilis reddi possit? Hoc vos rogo, quia iam duodecim annos ipse magister linguae Latinae alias magistros eiusdem linguae innumerabiles id ipsum rogavi, quorum quidem paucissimi apposite atque ad persuadendum respondere potuerunt. Quid enim de advocationi medicive intelligentia iudicium censuramque faciat, si ille de arte sua vel de exercitatione nullam rationem dare possit? Ac de magistri linguae Latinae sententia quam censuram faciat, si ille de disciplina sua atque arte nullam rationem dare possit? Prorsus mirum est atque admirabile quot magistri linguae litterarumque et Graecorum Romanorumque nullam fere rationem reddere possint quamobrem haec studia colenda sint. Primum igitur necesse est nos qui iuvenes in his studiis erudire conantur iustum atque idoneam rationem dare posse. Innumerabilia enim studia

<sup>1</sup>This Salutatory was delivered at the meeting of The Classical Section of The New York State Teachers' Association, at Buffalo, November 22, 1921.

intentionem hodie studiumque discipulorum huius saeculi exiunt ac postulant, quare etiam magis necesse est nos magistros intellegere quibus de causis validis studium linguae Latinae inter haec multa necessario adnumerandum sit. Quamobrem oportet nos semper paratos esse ad rationem appositam exhibendam, si quis nos roget, 'Quare tandem contendis oportere iuvenes hodie studio linguae Latinae operam dare?'

Sed finem faciam. Ex omnibus quae dixi benevolenter atque aequo animo patiamini me vos monere duobus esse opus praepositum: primum necesse est nos fidem habere validam in vi et virtute studi linguae litterarumque et Graecorum et Romanorum, ac deinde nos hanc fidem quae in nobis sita sit impavide atque intrepide ubique et cotidie praedicare ac palam sine metu efferre.

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

THEODORE A. MILLER

**MR. BROWN'S "LATIN IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS".**

(Concluded from page 160)

The table showing the rank in Latin in 1915-1916 of Freshmen who had entered College from the Schools investigated by Mr. Brown and the average rank in Latin of all Freshmen in the same Colleges is given by Mr. Brown to prove that the Schools of New Hampshire are doing at least as good work in Latin as those of the country as a whole. The figures are so small, however, that they prove nothing. Only 39 New Hampshire Freshmen are counted, and Dartmouth and Bates are the only institutions in which there were more than five of them. If the table proves anything, it proves that the Schools are not so inefficient in their handling of Latin as Mr. Brown's tests seem to indicate. The folly of inference from a small number of instances is well illustrated in the comment on the record of the Freshmen from one School, which sent three students to College in 1915. Two went to Amherst, where their average in Latin was about five per cent. below the general average; the third went to Bates, where his average was 15 per cent. above the general average, and 15 per cent. below the average of the six students from New Hampshire. Now, Mr. Brown's tests show this same School scoring in the fourth year above the average of the Schools using the Translation Method, in all of the five significant particulars. Yet the record of its three graduates in College is cited as a poor showing for the Grammatical Method.

Mr. Brown's animadversions on the effect of the study of Latin upon pupils' English are so violent and dogmatical, and he so palpably neglects essential factors as to make one feel that the whole investigation may be vitiated by an unscientific haste in reasoning or by antecedent bias. He maintains that "Latin as taught is a positive detriment to the learning of English", affirming, on what evidence of consentient opinion I cannot guess, that this fact is well known to Superintendents of Schools and Principals. But this is not all. He finds in his own test an abundance of

facts to prove that Latin does not, for most pupils, promote "logical thinking, power of exact statement, facility and precision in the use of English and similar abilities". It must be admitted that the evidence he presents does not prove the contrary, but that is another matter. It may be that nothing is proved, except that the test was not of such a sort or so set as to afford real evidence of any sort; or that the pupils whom he tested have not seriously studied Latin at all; or that the nature of our civilization and our educational practice unfit pupils to reason and write clearly. Even if Mr. Brown's test was a reasonable one, we still need to know whether the pupils he tested could have shown a higher ability in logic and in expression, if tested on similar material in some other subject. We need to know also whether pupils who had had no Latin could have shown a higher ability in some test equally adapted to both classes

We are not told how long a time was allowed for the translation which Mr. Brown judges as English, and this, as I have already pointed out, is a most important consideration. The passage set was from Caesar's Civil War, 2.23-26, "with a few slight adaptations <and large omissions>", and was the same for all classes above the first. 21 Schools were tested, how many pupils we are not told. The vocabulary is open to the same criticism that I have made on the other test in connected Latin, with the addition that there are words all through the passage that even the second year pupil could not be expected to know. A good instance is *appellere*, 'to put in', which, moreover, is found in the same sentence with *appellare*. This *appellere* is the verb of a brief portion of the text, the mistranslation of which is held up as a horrible example. Another such portion contains *statio*, 'anchorage', and *eminentibus promunturis*. You cannot ask even school-boys and school-girls to reason exactly and write correctly about things they do not understand. The last fourteen lines of the thirty-four of this Test formed the passage set by the College Entrance Examination Board in 1916 on the paper in Second Year Latin. The meaning of five words was given. The allowance of time was sufficient, and it is my recollection that the rendering was fairly satisfactory English idiom. 68.5 per cent. of the 2,115 books were given a rating of 60 or higher, 80.7 a rating of 50 or higher, 5.8 a rating from 90 to 100.

In one of the Schools in which the tests were given the average number of minutes per week devoted to the study of Latin throughout the four years was 240. In other words, pupils in this School were spending 576 hours on Latin in the four years—only 36 hours more than the boys at Exeter give to it in the first year alone. 240 minutes is the minimum for the Schools examined by Mr. Brown; the maximum is 790. The middle allotment in the lower half is 418 minutes, and in the upper half 565. Mr. Brown speaks of those Schools which devote an excessive amount of time to Latin, but does not indicate where the excess begins. Though better results are shown by the Schools which spend the greater amount of time on the subject, they are not enough better to satisfy

him. He would have them reduce the time they give to Latin *and* improve their methods of instruction.

Do the variations in such tests as these tell us whether there is a proper relation between time spent and achievement? And just what should be the superiority in score for each additional hour a week? One point is clearly established, that the group of Schools which employ the Translation Method, though they give less time to Latin than the other groups, get a comparatively satisfactory result, measured by these tests. Yet there is little difference in the time spent in class, and it is probable that the time supposed to be spent in study at home or at School is wasted through misdirection of effort or lack of supervision. At any rate, the tests show no substantial knowledge of grammar, to which Mr. Brown assumes that the additional time is devoted.

One of the most valuable chapters of the book is that in which Mr. Brown discusses the waste and hindrance due to keeping together pupils of widely differing ability. He admits that the single test which he used in this connection may not be a sure guide in the classification of pupils. He is undoubtedly right in holding that a classification according to ability can be made on the basis of a sufficient number of adequate tests, and there cannot be the slightest doubt that his criticism of the prevailing practice is justified by the facts. In every class there are those who cannot be expected to do the full work of the class, and those who are able to do much more than the normal assignment.

An improvement in this regard is surely desirable, but the reform proposed by Mr. Brown is itself clumsy, and might cause a greater loss than the present arrangement. He would have the classification determined by ability, after the first year, rather than dictated by a fixed course of graded reading. In one year Caesar would be read by all pupils of the highest ability; in another year, Cicero; and in the third year, Vergil. In other years these authors would be in the hands of those of the lowest ability, and in still other years they would fall to the medial class. At regular intervals, therefore, the slow second year pupil would be forced to grapple with Vergil and Cicero, and at regular intervals the fast fourth year pupil would read Caesar. The reading could not be regulated to correspond to the stage reached by the pupil, since there would be pupils at all three stages in all three classes. Other similar difficulties will be apparent at once. The plan does not fit in with the scheme of College Entrance examinations, but Mr. Brown would probably feel no concern about that. It should be said that he confines his suggestion to Schools which have only enough pupils in Latin for four divisions. Where the pupils in any year of the course are so many as to call for division of the class, the division should always be made according to ability.

In this chapter Mr. Brown again shows some ignorance of the possibilities of accomplishment in the teaching of Latin in our Schools under present conditions, and manifests a certain Utopian doctrinarianism. He believes that the first third of the pupils

could cover in three years (presumably within the modest time-allotment that he advocates) all the Latin now read in School, and that of the first two years of the College course. He soberly estimates that this superior third might translate six books of Vergil in two months.

The final chapter makes it evident that Mr. Brown is primarily concerned with theory. He disclaims the intention of discussing the subject of this chapter, the teaching of Latin, in any other light than that of his statistics, yet he interprets the statistics as indicating that the traditional reading of the Schools is unsuitable. It will be remembered that the only tests in connected reading which he set were on passages from Caesar, and that these tests were taken by pupils in all of the last three years of the course. It might be possible to conclude from the results that Caesar cannot be read profitably for three years, if the pupils examined had been reading Caesar during all the three years.

By way of clinching his arguments, he supposes an attempt to teach English to a foreigner by the methods and with the sort of material commonly used for Latin. Is there any validity in the analogy? Are the ends sought similar? Could we, if we wished, manufacture, for Latin, the material that lies ready to our hand for English, or create the environment that in the other case is inevitable? Moreover, Mr. Brown gives no countenance to the Direct Method, and disapproves of work in composition. He suggests that the teaching of composition in the first three years of the course may be "a direct hindrance to the process of acquiring a ready and effective grasp of the thought of the Latin". What would he say of this restriction to reading in the teaching of English to a foreigner?

In this final chapter Mr. Brown returns to his attack upon the teaching of Latin grammar. He holds that pupils should "learn to translate Latin somewhat effectively,—just as they learn to talk or to read English,—before entering upon a detailed and more or less abstract study of the grammar of the language". Now, there is really no abstract study of grammar in the great majority of American Schools, if in any of them; and the amount of time given to grammar in the Schools examined during this investigation must be greatly overestimated. If it is not, the Schools need a more general investigation. It is entirely possible to teach a section of boys sorted out as the dullards of a beginning class more syntax in six months than the pupils tested by Mr. Brown had learned in four years. Furthermore, the best results for all four years were shown by the Schools which use a modified Grammatical Method—a large amount of systematic study of grammar in the first year, and attention centered upon translation after that year, with thorough drill on grammatical principles once a week in connection with a lesson in composition—the method which prevails generally throughout the country. The average score of this group of Schools was highest in thirteen of the eighteen significant items. My reckoning includes as three items the "amount correct" in the Connected Latin Test, which disregards the

amount that was incorrectly rendered. Here the Translation Method Schools had the highest score in all three years, and it is upon this score that Mr. Brown bases his claims for that method; but it may well be questioned whether it is better to translate a larger amount on such a test than to get what is translated more nearly correct.

Mr. Brown points to the "exact source of the failure" in Latin, and implies that his tests support his contention. That this is not a reasonable claim will be clear from the mere quotation of his statement of the causes of failure (137):

... (1) lack of adaptation of the subject as now taught to the needs of adolescent youth; (2) absence of the application of well-recognized principles of administration and pedagogy; (3) poor choice of the Latin material constituting the content of the course.

In another place (121) he writes:

Our present methods in Latin are not succeeding well with more than a quarter of our pupils and the chief reason is the failure to break away from traditional practices and apply the principles of modern scientific supervision and administration.

Whatever allowance is made for defects in the tests, there can be no doubt that the showing for Latin remains entirely unsatisfactory; but there is nothing in Mr. Brown's facts to warrant him in offering a program of reform as other than a personal contribution to the solution of the problem. Despite all my strictures, I believe that Latin teachers can find something of profit in this contribution. I single out as deserving of especial consideration the emphasis Mr. Brown puts upon the training of pupils to get the meaning of Latin, upon the teaching of functional grammar, and upon reading for the thought.

THE PHILLIPS EXETER ACADEMY JOHN C. KIRTLAND

#### THE ANCIENT FISH-TABOO

In *The Classical Journal* 17.226 (January, 1922), Professor John A. Scott attempted to account for the interdict imposed on the use of fish according to the ritual of the goddess Cybele, which is discussed by Julian the Apostate in his declamation on the Mother of the Gods. Professor Scott takes the stand that this prohibition arises from the fact that the fish in the rivers of Phrygia, where the cult of Cybele originated, are—and presumably were also in ancient times—of an altogether unpalatable and unwholesome nature.

The question of the psychology of the primitive mind and the interpretation of early beliefs and practices are matters of extreme complexity. The science of folk-lore is, relatively speaking, yet in its infancy. Nevertheless, this study has been rewarded by the discovery of several very important principles. Thus, it has been shown more clearly, year by year, by sociologists and anthropologists that the primitive taboo is not, as once was supposed, concerned with any considerations of utility or expediency. Rather, the taboo is applied as the outcome of a perverse and childish system of reasoning, with which the magical

and the occult are hopelessly blended. Indeed, it appears to be quite impossible for the primitive man to differentiate the material from the supernatural; hence taboo and kindred elements arise simply from a perverted philosophy. In other words, we may expect to find no logic—according to our ideas of the term—in the mind of the savage. A pair of examples, which happen to involve the fish-taboo, will suffice to illustrate.

It was formerly the custom among the Nootka Indians of British Columbia, Canada, to abstain entirely from the eating of fish for a period of two months after they had partaken of bear-meat. Now the fish of this region are, undoubtedly, as fine as any to be found in the world; and the abstinence on the part of the Indians, we learn, had nothing to do with any fear of evil results attending a mixed diet of fish and bear's flesh. They candidly explained the taboo as arising from a concern lest the salmon and the cod should get word of their action and, being offended thereat, should refuse in the future to enter the net or take the bait (see Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough, Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild*, 2.251). The fish was taboo among the Abipones of Paraguay on the ground that it is a delicate, defenceless creature and as such would produce cowardice and sloth in those who partook of it. On the other hand, for reasons obvious enough, the Abipones were much addicted to a diet consisting of the tough, rank meat of jaguars (Frazer, 141).

Furthermore, it is clearly demonstrable that the priest places the taboo, not upon that which is unpleasant or abhorred by the barbarian, but upon just the opposite. The ban is placed upon what is *per se* pleasurable or on that which seems likely, humanly speaking, to confer a benefit. In other words, the taboo is applied for some supposedly far-seeing and supernatural reason. Likewise it is manifestly a work of supererogation to place an interdict on any act of which the evil consequences are immediately and pointedly obvious.

If, then, we assume, with Professor Scott, that the rivers of Phrygia in ancient, as well as in modern, times were filled with fish both unpalatable and unwholesome, it seems impossible to understand why any ban on fish-eating should have been thought necessary. The Phrygians must surely have avoided a fish-diet from the very nature of the circumstances, and both the principles outlined above would militate strongly against the supposition of there being any necessity for a specific taboo. It would therefore appear altogether unlikely that Professor Scott's theory would be accepted by any anthropologist or student of comparative religion.

While speculation in a field of this sort is extremely hazardous, it may be possible, I think, to suggest an alternative theory for this taboo occurring in the ritual of Cybele. While the ancient Phrygia in which this cult arose did not entirely coincide, geographically, with the later Roman territory, it is certain that the Phrygians were essentially a people of the highlands, cut off from intercourse with the sea during most of

their history, and in early times greatly influenced by the Hittites, who may be said to have been to an even greater extent denizens of the uplands and of the hills. Cybele too—notwithstanding the fact that Apollonius Rhodius (*Argonautica* 1.1098) in one place characterizes her as having dominion over the air and the waters as well as over the land—was originally a deity of the soil itself, a goddess of mountains and caves, who delighted in the fruits of the field (*Argonautica* 1.1140 ff.). Hence, the Phrygians may have feared and even hated the sea, and the primitive Earth Mother may long have refused to be associated with the ocean. This dislike could have been most readily made manifest by a taboo on fish—the fruits of the sea. There are many instances on record of hatred of the salt-water by inland peoples. According to Frazer, the Basutos have an instinctive horror of the ocean, although they have never seen it. Furthermore, he says (*Golden Bough, Taboo and the Perils of the Soul*, 10),

When the Indians of the Peruvian Andes were sent by the Spaniards to work in the hot valleys of the coast, the vast ocean which they saw before them as they descended the Cordillera was dreaded by them as a cause of disease. . . . Similarly the inland people of Lampung in Sumatra are said to pay a kind of adoration to the sea, and to make it an offering of cakes and sweetmeats when they behold it for the first time, deprecating its power to do them mischief.

Most suggestive, too, is the statement of Plutarch (*Isis et Osiris* 32) concerning the attitude of the Egyptian priests towards the sea. So great was their repugnance to it that they would not converse with seafaring men, and they refused to eat salt or fish—emblems of the ocean. The likeness of a fish served as the hieroglyphic symbol for 'hated'. It seems probable, I think, that the same principle was operative in the case of Cybele, and that this primitive taboo persisted long after the goddess had become the all-embracing Great Mother of the terrestrial globe.

In the same article, Professor Scott further says:

In this Journal XII, 328, I tried to prove that the Homeric antipathy to fish was due to the fact that the fish in the streams around Smyrna make very poor food and that the Homeric poetry reflects the feelings or dislikes of a man from Smyrna.

The subject he elaborates in his *Unity of Homer*, 6 f., where he attempts to prove the Smyrnaean origin of Homer. Here we have the remark:

... yet in Homer the heroes spurned fish and the two passages which describe the eating of that food add the pardoning phrase, 'for they were on the verge of starvation'.

The question involved here calls, manifestly, for some different explanation from the former, unless indeed we are to believe that the maritime peoples of Asia Minor bore towards the sea a feeling of love not unmixed with hate and fear, an echo of which we might discern in the words of the writer of the *Book of Revelation*, 31.1, relative to the New Heaven and the New Earth. But this would be carrying assumption too far. The Smyrnaeans, however, must surely have known a great deal more about salt-water fish

than about fresh-water fish. As anyone who has lived on the sea-coast knows, the maritime peoples concern themselves little with the products of the streams of the hinterland—with such exceptions, to be sure, as we might find in the case of the great salmon-rivers of British Columbia. The fresh-water fish of Asia Minor are worthless; but the people of Smyrna had the Aegean at their front door. Why scorn fish in the mass when a few were unsound?

Although the Homeric *heroes* may have turned up their noses at this diet, we hear a good deal, nevertheless, about fish and fishing in the Homeric poem. According to Owen and Goodspeed's Homeric Vocabularies, the word *ἰχθύς* is found between ten and twenty-five times. The exact figure I am ignorant of. We also have fairly numerous allusions to net-fishing and at least six to fishing with the rod (Il. 16.406-409, 24.79-82; Od. 4.368, 10.124, 12.251-255, 330). Some of these latter allusions merely mention the piscatorial art; the others seem to refer specifically to deep-sea fishing.

The fish thus caught must have been eaten. Just why the heroes slight this edible seems very difficult to explain. Can it be that we have here a survival of the primitive idea found in many tribes that the king must, so far as possible, sequester himself from marine influences (compare Frazer, *Taboo*, etc., 9 f.)? It is conceivable that the 'Zeus-born Kings' of Homer would thus, by tradition, have a different attitude towards fish from that displayed by the common herd.

ALLEGHENY COLLEGE,  
MEADVILLE, PA.

A. D. FRASER

## REVIEWS

*The Art of Transition in Plato.* By Grace Hadley Billings. University of Chicago Dissertation (1920). Pp. 104.

This dissertation presents the art of transition in Plato from three different points of view. Chapter I, Main Transitions (4-52), deals with the transition from one main division of a dialogue to another, and resolves itself into a description of the logical framework of the dialogue. After discussing the transitions from the introduction to the main body of the dialogue, and from the latter to the conclusion, the author illustrates Plato's method by brief analyses of the connection of the thought in the *Laches*, the *Gorgias*, the *Phaedrus*, and the *Meno*, and by detailed analyses of the *Phaedo*, the *Theaetetus*, the *Philebus*, the *Republic*, and the *Laws*. This leads incidentally to a discussion, which might well have been more extended, of the unity of the *Republic*, and of the *Philebus*. Chapter II, Minor Conventional Forms of Transition (53-70), deals with Plato's use of conventional transitional formulas, such as e.g. a brief formula of command (*σκέψεις δῆ καὶ τόδε, ἀλλὰ πάλιν τινὲς ἐξ ἀρχῆς*), or a prothetic statement of intention, as the myth in the *Protagoras* is introduced by *δοκεῖ τοι εὖ μοι, Εφη, χαρίστερος εἰς μόθον ὑμῖν λέγειν*

This may be combined with a formal dismissal of the preceding discussion, such as *τοῦτο μὲν ἔστοι, τόδε δὲ δλλο ἀνθεγες ἐπισκεψώμεθα*.

Many more transitional formulas are noticed, but this will give a fair sample of the contents of the chapter. It concludes with a discussion of the use of particles in transition. Full but not exhaustive lists are given of all the methods of transition discussed. Chapter III, The Literary Art of Transition (71-101), considers what may be called stylistic tricks—the transitional use of proverbs, quotations, images, continued metaphors, digressions, parodies, etc.

As a study of the technique of a great literary artist, such a dissertation can hardly fail to be interesting and enlightening. One may question, however, whether the work might not have been more productive of results if the author had limited the field, and had treated one section exhaustively, instead of sinking experimental shafts in three separate portions. Any one of the three chapters, if made definitive rather than suggestive, might be very fertile in results of importance in the critical interpretation of the Platonic dialogues. As it is, the reader gets the impression of a great deal of description with very little result. I have mentioned above the possibility of utilizing such an analysis as is given in the first chapter in settling the oft-discussed question of the unity of the Republic. Likewise, the statistical studies on particles in the second chapter might have yielded some additions to the Sprachstatistik of Plato's dialogues. Dr. Billings gives one example in an appendix: *ποῖος* in transition occurs three times in Laches, Lysis, Charmides, thirteen in the Theaetetus, forty-three in the Philebus. Similar results from the material presented in Chapter II would have been desirable. It is to be hoped that the author will carry to their full development the investigations here begun.

YALE UNIVERSITY

HARRY M. HUBBELL

Etruskische Malerei. Mit 89 Textabbildungen und 101 Tafeln. By Fritz Weege. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag (1921). Pp. VIII + 120.

The perennial interest in the Etruscans, their art and their archaeology, their language and their history, has again been emphasized by the publication in 1921 of two important works. Mrs. Van Buren has presented in book form, with numerous illustrations, the results of her studies of the early architectural terracotta sculptures in Etruria and Latium<sup>1</sup>. Dr. Weege has issued the volume under review as the first part of an extensive study of Etruscan painting.

If a visit to the painted tombs at Corneto-Tarquinia<sup>2</sup> be preceded by a study of the reproductions of the paintings, preserved in various museums or published occasionally in the earlier volumes on Etruria, the visitor will be astonished at the beauty and delicacy

<sup>1</sup>Figurative Terra-cotta Revetments in Etruria and Latium in the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B. C. By E. Douglas Van Buren. London: John Murray (1921).

<sup>2</sup>The name of the modern town has now been changed (1921) by Governmental legislation from Corneto-Tarquinia to Tarquinia.

and harmony of the colors of the frescoes still perfectly preserved in many of these subterranean sepulchers. The colors of the reproductions are invariably harsh and crude, whereas the original colors are of unusually delicate shades and tones. Weege, in his Introduction (VI), justly remarks that not a single one of the many painted tombs at Corneto has been accurately published. His aim is to supply this great lack by a comprehensive work on the paintings at Tarquinia and elsewhere in Etruria. But, on account of the shortage of paper and of the difficulties and excessive costs of publication, the present volume is limited to Tarquinia, and unfortunately there are no reproductions in color.

It is, of course, obvious that no true impression of a painting can be conveyed without the reproduction of the colors in as accurate a degree as may be possible, as Herrmann has done in the occasional colored plates of the Denkmäler der Malerei des Altertums, and as has been done for the Alexander sarcophagus, for some of the Korai on the Acropolis, and in many other cases. Similar accurate reproductions of Etruscan paintings are urgently needed for the purpose of bringing before wider artistic circles these masterpieces in color of the sixth and fifth centuries before Christ<sup>3</sup>. But, after a careful study of the paintings in the tombs at Tarquinia, in comparison with earlier photographs of these works, I can not agree with Weege's statement (VI), that the paintings are rapidly disappearing and that in a short time only faint traces of them will be visible. Dennis makes this same plaint in his Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria, 1.322-323 (1848), but still in many cases, as for example in the Tomba del Barone, Tomba dei Tori, Tomba degli Auguri, Tomba delle Leonesse, and others, the colors seem to be as brilliant as ever, and the guardian of the tombs told me that in these cases he had noticed no diminution in the brilliance of the colors throughout a period of many years.

In the absence of plates in color the best substitute is photography and the great merit of Weege's book is the presentation of a hundred plates of admirable reproductions of good photographs. Here one sees the portraits, strongly individualised, of the inhabitants of Tarquinia in the sixth, fifth, and later centuries before Christ. Particularly noticeable is the interesting profile of the young woman in the Tomba dell' Orco which is used as frontispiece of the book, and very striking are the characteristic portraits of the celebrants in the banquet scene of the Tomba dei Leopardi (Plates 14-22).

The scenes represented on these frescoes are most varied in their character. Sometimes they are pictures taken from everyday life, as in the Tomba della Caccia e Pesci (63-64, and Plate 2), where is represented the delightful picture of a youth diving into the sea from a cliff, with flocks of birds hovering around and dolphins plunging above the waves. Athletic contests are often depicted on the walls, as the wrestling-bout in

<sup>3</sup>The reproductions in color of paintings in the Tomba dei Leopardi published by Weege in Jahrbuch des Instituts, 31 (1916), Plates 9 and 11, are not very satisfactory.

the Tomba degli Auguri (Plate 93), and the scenes from horse-races in the Tomba delle Iscrizioni (Plate 73), and in the Tomba del Barone (Plates 76-83), and especially the games of many kinds, before spectators, in the Tomba delle Bighe (Beilage II). But most interesting of all these wall-paintings are the representations of scenes in the lower world which are found in the Tomba del Cardinale (36-37, Plate 59), in the Tomba dell' Orco (Plates 60-65), in the Tomba del Tifone (Plate 49), and elsewhere. Because of the unusual and interesting character of these scenes Weege devotes the longest chapter of the book, III (22-56), to a study of the views in regard to the other world held by the Etruscans, and their representation in painting. The idea of a 'Hell' where virtue is rewarded and crime is punished is due to the influence and the teaching of Orphics and Pythagoreans, and the presence of this motive in art is traced from the fifth century before Christ down through the Middle Ages, to modern times, through the stages 'Orphic, Etruscan, Divine Comedy, Faust' in a chapter unjustifiably diffuse from the point of view of Etruscan painting.

Another chapter, IV, is concerned with the Etruscans as a people, discussing their name, their origin, their history, their language, etc. Emphasis is laid on the fact that, although more than 8,000 inscriptions in the Etruscan language have been preserved, scholars still know little or nothing of the language, apart from the decipherment of occasional words. In regard to the origin of the people Weege gives a brief résumé of some of the current views (65 ff.), and, while not insisting literally upon the tradition of their emigration from Lydia, he believes, with most modern scholars, that their race, their culture, and their high artistic gifts point to the East, and that Seneca was quite right in the expression of the beliefs of his own time with the familiar words, *Tuscos Asia sibi vindicat* (Dialogues 12.7.2).

The history of the discovery of the graves at Corneto is related in a long chapter, VI (72-104), which is made up largely of extracts from the reports and descriptions of the early discoverers and travelers. All this matter is very interesting, but it has little to do with the immediate subject of the book, Etruscan painting. It is, indeed, regrettable that so much space (104 pages in all,) is given to these general considerations that there is no space left even for a description of the Plates in the book, while only four pages are assigned to the particular subject of the paintings at Tarquinia. It is much to be desired that the next volume should contain a full description of the Plates, with an accurate statement of the colors employed, such as invariably accompanies the plates of the *Denkmäler der Malerei*. It is also specially important that a book of reference of this character should have a full Index (there is no Index at all in the present volume). But in spite of these lacunae in the book one must be very grateful for the assembly in convenient form of more than a hundred excellent photographs of these extraordinary paintings.

ROME, ITALY

T. LESLIE SHEAR

*Vom Altertum Zur Gegenwart: Die Kulturzusammenhänge in den Hauptepochen und auf den Hauptgebieten.* Edited by E. Norden and A. Giesecke. Leipzig: Teubner (1919). Pp. viii + 308.

The authors of the papers here collected set forth the connections between classical antiquity and the modern world in a variety of fields—politics, religion, art, literature, law, history, economics, linguistics, and the sciences. All this is preceded by suggestive sketches of the transition period between antiquity and the Middle Ages, the revival of ancient culture in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and the new humanism and the nineteenth century. Of the twenty-six contributors only five are classicists; three are historians, two lawyers, two philosophers, two professors of pedagogy. The other fields of knowledge are represented, each of them, by a single spokesman.

Such a book cannot be summarized. Suffice it to say that at every point it is at the forefront of modern scientific thought, that the aperçus are often instructive and stimulating, and that the volume makes a noteworthy contribution to classical apologetics, which, though intended primarily for German readers, is almost as useful for those of any other country in Western civilization. A few points of particular interest to the reviewer may be touched upon as samples of the contents.

W. Jäger points out how the Greeks first formulated some of our greatest modern problems, e. g. (1) the due proportion of aristocratic and democratic elements in society, (2) the transformation of the State from a mere instrument for the development of force into an agency for the advancement of culture, and (3) the organic unity of public education (16). W. Goetz and L. Curtius dwell upon the crucial significance in the development of our modern world of Charlemagne's resuscitation of classical civilization (54, 182). Eduard Meyer observes that the unique American institution of the actual supremacy of the law (through the Constitution and the courts) is a realization of what was essentially the Athenian ideal (84). Very brilliant also is Meyer's discussion of the historical significance of the action of Socrates and his followers who sought in education the proper training for leadership in the State (89), and his drastic picture of the decline of ancient civilization in the ruin of the farming class, the crowding into the cities of inert and pleasure-loving masses, and the loss of control by the educated classes over the policies of the State, tendencies which seem to recur to-day, although as yet on no such alarming scale (86, 95 ff.). Striking also is the assertion (115) of a professor of pedagogy, J. Ziehen, that 'the inheritance from antiquity in the field of education is so immeasurably great, that, restricting one's self to the essentials, one would find it easier to list what has been contributed since then than to specify what has been taken over from ancient times'.

A layman is almost surprised to find that the French and German medieval epics were so markedly influenced by classical tradition as G. Roethe, Professor of Germanic Philology at Berlin, insists (155 f.), and it is

noteworthy to see so eminent a modern philologist assert that the loss of classical antiquity means nothing less than the death of modern literature (153), and that 'we need the ancients more than ever in order to find ourselves again' (173). M. Wundt clears away the erroneous impression that Scholasticism was swept aside because it adhered to the past; the truth, he declares, is precisely the opposite; it was (200 f.) 'because Scholasticism misrepresented the ancient tradition, and towards the end actually drew away from it, that it was abandoned. The genuine Aristotle was called upon to refute the Scholastic Aristotle. Or those for whom Scholasticism had completely spoiled the taste for the great systematizer appealed to other ancient thinkers, Plato, the Stoics, the Neoplatonists, and Aristotle'.

Descartes was purely Platonic in the foundation of his philosophy (201). The German philosophy of the nineteenth century is unimaginable and incomprehensible without Greek philosophy (202); Nietzsche, of course, and even Wundt are saturated with ancient thought (207). E. Goldbeck shows how the great stimulating ideas in modern physics come from the atomistic theory of Democritus and from Plato (234). F. Boll eloquently pictures the Greek spirit as one of freedom striving always for the formulation of new law (240). A. Rehm answers the shallow but ever-recurring contention that the Greeks never studied the civilizations of other peoples, so that we need not study theirs; this he does by showing how eagerly they learned from every side all that they could in the technical arts, and then outdid their teachers (280). He stresses also the rather curious fact that the great age of Athenian culture was singularly poor in technical inventions (282); one wonders if the converse of such a principle necessarily holds true. E. Fraenkel observes how useless it is to preach the study of the Classics to those who are not prepared to make some sacrifice to the life of the spirit (290), the fundamental difficulty with modern Philistinism. Especially fine is this passage (296-297):

'One who has truly felt the sound, the structure, and the content of genuine Greek literature, be it merely a piece of the most simple prose, has come into possession of one of the rarest manifestations of the native nobility of the human soul. Henceforward his ear is attuned to the dignity of speech wherever he meets it, within him there persists a never satisfied yearning to shape his own utterance also in clearness and purity, he will shudder with a wholesome abhorrence of what fills the columns of our newspapers to-day, which sprawls nerveless and sullied wherever men speak and write, even into the realm of that which professes to be art... Nietzsche criticized once a wretched and wooden German sentence with the exclamation, "I adjure you to translate that into Latin, so as to realize what a shameless misuse you are making of the language".

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS      W. A. OLDFATHER

#### JINGLE BELLS

Nives, glacies, nox, pueria!  
Risus decet, nunc decent carmina!  
Laetos iuvat nos ire per agros!  
Traha fert velociter, cachinemus nos!  
Chorus:  
Tinniat, tinniat tintinnabulum!  
Labimur in glacie post mulum curtum!

Tinniat, tinniat tintinnabulum!  
Labimur in glacie post mulum curtum!  
Me nuper miserum temptavit lunae lux!  
Mox assidebat tum puella facti dux!  
Vecti subito in nivis cumulos—  
caballus est perterritus et tunc eversi nos!

Solum scintillat, nive candidum,  
repetatur nunc concentus carminum!  
Canities abest morosa omnibus!  
Puellulas cum pueris delectat hic cursus!

COLORADO COLLEGE,  
COLORADO SPRINGS

CHARLES C. MIEROW

#### THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The 160th meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia was held on Friday evening, February 3, with thirty-two members and guests present.

Under the heading of minor communications, Dr. E. W. Burlingame read several of his translations of medieval Latin and Greek legends derived from Pali originals. A continuous stream of these legends poured into Europe from the East from the eighth to the fifteenth century. They probably were brought in by traders and widely disseminated by Dominican and Franciscan preachers. The paper of the evening was read by Mr. E. S. Gerhard, on Classic and Romantic Tragedy. The reader gave a minute analysis of the differences between these two great classes of tragedy, showing that they consisted in (1) the status and structure of the theater; (2) the structure and technique of the plays; (3) the spirit and motive of the plays; (4) the conceptions of life and art prevailing in the times of each.

B. W. MITCHELL, *Secretary.*

#### SPLITTING ROCKS WITH COLD WATER<sup>1</sup>

One of our New Jersey readers has on his place a number of large stones that he wants to use for building purposes, but he is having great trouble in breaking them. How can this be done without the use of a machine? One old method which we have often seen employed is based on force of contraction. The stones are first heated by building a fire around or on top of them. When they are made as hot as desired a bucket or tub of cold water is suddenly dashed over them. The heat of the fire causes a slight expansion of the rock and the sudden cooling by the cold water causes contraction, which usually splits or breaks the rock in pieces. This is not in any way a new process. We saw it tried years ago on the old farm in New England, and the histories state how Hannibal, when he marched over the Alps to fall upon the Romans, used this method to make a way through mountain passes. The histories state that Hannibal used vinegar after heating the rock by building fires against it, but it is more likely that cold water was used as here described. Some years ago we mentioned this matter and received comment from a large number of our readers, some of whom told some remarkable stories of the tremendous force exerted by this power of contraction. In one particular case a party of hunters were traveling through the Rocky Mountains. They built a camp-fire on a rock ledge. It burned all night, and in the morning the rock was very hot. In order to avoid any danger from forest fires they proceeded to put out their campfire by dashing water over it. To their astonishment a good-sized piece of the ledge suddenly split and dropped away as the result of this sudden cooling.

<sup>1</sup>This clipping, from The Rural New Yorker, for January, was sent to me by Dr. Roscoe Guernsey, Executive Secretary of The American Academy in Rome. For the reference to Hannibal's exploit see Livy 21-37. 2-3.

C. K.